DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 074 304 VT 019 857

AUTHOR	Willers, Jack C.
TITLE	Career, Culture and Consciousness: A Study of the Social and Theoretical Bases of Career Education.
INSTITUTION	Auburn Univ., Ala.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Feb 72
CONTRACT	OEC-0-71-0441
NOTE	66p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Career Education; Continuous Learning; *Cultural Context; Culture Conflict; Educational Attitudes; Educational Change; Educational Objectives; *Foundations of Education; Futures (of Society); Human Development; *Humanization; Self Actualization; Sequential Learning; *Social Change; Values

ABSTRACT

Conflicting attitudes toward current American social problems may emphasize either the instabilities of social crisis and cultural confusion or the formulating of a more meaningful future through intelligent action. Particularly in the field of education both the despairing critics and the hopeful reformers are in obvious conflict today. Thus, career education--the education of the masses for democratic participation in redesigning their own future--is becoming a major force for educational reform and also for the redirection and stabilization of social forces. Career education programs will increasingly contribute to the economic, political, and cultural life-styles of our future society. Knowledge and understanding of the bases of career education are imperative for designing such programs. The present American infatuation for the instantaneous and the accelerated is dangerous. It may be significant that the Greek word for "instant" is derived from the verb meaning "to waste, to ravage". Human development cannot be instant, biologically or psychologically. A new career educational sequencing is needed in which learning becomes a form of continuing growth and life, not just achieving some marketable skill. Career education has the responsibility of teaching the skills of evaluation as well as those of production. (MF)

ED 074304

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CAREER, CULTURE AND CONSCIOUSNESS

A Study of the Social and Theoretical Bases

of

Career Education

submitted by

Jack C. Willers
Professor of Foundations of Education
Auburn University

to

The Model Management Career Education Task Force
U.S. Office of Education

February, 1972

Funded by the U.S. Office of Education under P.L. 89-10, Title IV.
Not for publication or reproduction in whole, or in part, or in any matter or form without the written consent of the Government until such time as the Government may have released such material to the public.

(OEC-0-71-0441)

AM015567

Table of Contents

Introduction

I. Career as Growth..... 5

II. Mobility and the Knowledge Economy.....18

III. Control and Conditioning.....26

IV. Consciousness.....33

V. Processing Personnel.....45

VI. Culture.....53

Bibliography 65

CAREER, CULTURE AND CONSCIOUSNESS

Introduction

The American society and Western culture are moving rapidly toward novel values and human relationships. Social problems in general and international complexities spur us to reach out for more meaningful directions and objectives. Basic human beliefs, attitudes and values have usually emerged gradually through less troubled social experiences. Today, however, the problems and issues, arising from technology, urbanization, mass communications, and rising economic aspirations and democratic expectations, pressure the American mind to re-discover, or still better, to invent those goals and core concepts which give cohesion to social action without stifling individual initiative and cultural diversity.

Such is this time of social crisis -- or cultural confusion. At just that time when most of our traditional certainties are being questioned and rejected, innovations in the means of experience appear increasingly obstructive to the definition of more viable ends. Yet social theorists have been aware for some time of an ironic relationship between the rate and regulation of cultural change. The faster the change, the greater the possibilities of control, much like the direction of an automobile on a curve is more easily controlled if acceleration is increased. Thus, while innovations reduce present social stability, they also enhance man's prospects of designing his own future.

Two opposite attitudes can, therefore, be generated toward our

current American social dilemmas, depending on whether we emphasize the pressing instabilities of the moment or the intelligence of men to cope with crises and formulate a future. The pressing instabilities of the moment can be emphasized, and feelings of national despair, fear and guilt easily emerge. Or, an emphasis on the prospects of formulating a more meaningful, human future through cooperative, intelligent social action may stimulate positive and optimistic attitudes of hopefulness and confidence.

In no other social endeavor are these conflicting attitudes more evident than in education. And never in the history of education have both the despairing critics and the confident reformers been as obviously in conflict as they are today. As the nation's eyes focus more and more on both the dilemmas and expectations of education, the relationships, between education and the quality of life have become increasingly apparent, yet decidedly more confusing. Are the schools and the nature of education a contributing factor to current social imbalances, or does the institution of education reflect the confusion of our times? Probably both. But most current efforts at educational reform, whether legal, political, economic or from within the teaching profession itself, display the vivid expectation that improved learning opportunities are to be judged by their general enhancement of the quality of life throughout the broader society.

Thus, career education -- the education of the masses for democratic participation in re-designing their own futures -- is fast becoming a major

prospect, not only for educational reform, but for the redirection and stabilization of more extensive social forces. Career educators, therefore, face the necessity of choosing emphases and directions that provide the bases for far-reaching social implications. As career education goes, so goes the nation may be an exaggeration -- but not much of one at that. For programs in career education will increasingly affect human developments which have direct input into the economic, political, and cultural life-styles of our future society.

It is imperative, therefore, that emerging and alternative directions and goals for career education continue to be identified through the widest possible knowledge and understanding of the social, theoretical and cultural bases for career education. What are the significant current and imminent social conditions that must be taken into consideration in designing career education programs? What cultural re-orientations are affecting the ways people relate and work and live which, in turn, demand the attention and understanding of career educators as they select the aims, content and methods of career education? What conceptual, theoretical frameworks are available to career educators as alternative sources for the criteria in judging the qualities of life and work and learning? These are questions without final answers, for social conditions and concepts of the good life remain in flux. But in questioning the partial answers and in clarifying such questions, flexible and tentative directions for career education do emerge as far better alternatives than trial-and-error gimmicks, faddish tricks-of-the-trade, or out-dated vested interests.

I. CAREER AS GROWTH

Instant Life: Now! --and for Evermore?

The Greeks had a word for "instant" which they fashioned from the verb meaning "to waste, to ravage." Contemporary American culture has seemingly lost every vistage of the adage that "haste makes waste." We are attuned to the instant, the immediate; our values are more readily attached to objects which can be possessed immediately and to experiences that can be enjoyed with little delay. Whatever takes time, demands effort, or delays gratification quickly loses its appeal. There is less time for growth in a complex society that demands greater maturity.

Examples of our infatuation with the instantaneous and the accelerated abound on every side of life. Instant foods and instant credit; automobiles which accelerate to ninety miles per hour in 6.3 seconds and travel at incredible speeds on roads, most of which were built for a slower, "less efficient" techno-culture. Cameras designed to produce the finished color picture in ninety seconds are redesigned to do the job in sixty. A people with increasingly larger amounts of time to spend enjoying life and leisure take less and less time to do those things they crave more but enjoy less.

This ironic fact of life--the cry for instant success, instant satisfaction, instant life amid the decay of the quality of life--is a dangerous threat to career education. It is now possible to obtain, for the correct fee of course, an instant doctor's degree, awarded by an "accreditated"

institution whose unscrupulous officers have learned how to take advantage of this need for immediate self-fulfillment, no matter how illusory. The real is what is, right now, no matter how deceptive; what will be or can be through time, planning, effort, achievement--the prospects and promises of the future--are unreal.

But it is not merely the poverty stricken, for whom the myths of the American dream never materialized, who see no reality beyond the momentary now. With delusions of unlimited resources, with exaggerated national pride coupled with the frontier fiction that we can always keep one step ahead of our own trash, many from all walks of life began to believe that life can be had now for nothing. A "God-chosen people" (at least that part of us whose ancestors were eligible to vote at the end of the Civil War) had entered the Promised Land; the millenium had begun. If so, the millenium was short-lived. The dreamers began to awaken with the assassination of Archduke Francis Ferdinand. The dreams were repeatedly shattered by depression, wars and the assassinations of John and Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King.

Still, a residue of dreams of which disasters are made overclouds the quality of life. The best in art, in human relations, in materials values, in skills and knowledge--in short, the best in life--is spontaneous, effortless, free--but meaningless.

This is not to judge those who claim the right to instant success and immediate fulfillment. Indeed, there is something noble and adventuresome in vigorously reaching out for what life has to offer at the moment. Nor

is there any logic in arguing for the necessity of work, for the value of hard labor in and of itself, or for the inevitability and redemptive power of suffering. Men and women today are working by the strength of their brains as well as by the sweat of their brows, and even moreso. Furthermore, by the power of reason and scientific intelligence we redeem ourselves from some forms of suffering--ignorance, illness--in ways far more noble than the passive acceptance of what was thought in the past to be unavoidable.

Nevertheless, a social experience which encourages the instant while threatening the enduring deserves some serious evaluation. There are biological and psychological reasons why we cannot, should not, expect the finer qualities of life instantaneously. After all, human beings are products of a gradual, natural process of development. We ourselves, physically, mentally, socially, are not instant creatures. We become and are becoming. So, buried deep within our strivings is the intuitive, if not the instinctive, knowledge that time and effort are the stuff of which social reality and human progress are made.

We also see this truth in our natural environment--in the rhythm of seasons, the migrations of birds and animals, the life that ever so slowly emerges from dying seed. But in our machine-made social environment we lose sight of the need for time to grow and learn when bulldozers literally change the face of the earth overnight, where buildings, even cities, rise up almost instantaneously, and the clock backs up with inconceivably rapid

travel through distant space.

The Sequence of Growth

Career education, designed to fashion the living careers of growing human beings caught up in a morass of change, must take into account--even utilize--this demand for the instant. Career education must become immediately rewarding in both its psychological and economic senses. At the same time, it must also be a preparation for the future--the kind of future that can prepare for itself still another and yet another future.

The concept of growth must pervade learning for living careers. Growth means two things: sequence and continuity. The sequential aspect of growth emphasizes succession, the notion that one thing follows after another. Results are the subsequent consequences of the foregoing, the preceeding. Sequence places experiences in some pattern, some relationship. Work, learning, effort, accomplishments which are actually forms of growth (not just promises of growth) are designed into a meaningful harmony. In human life accomplishments, satisfactions, pride, a sense of human dignity follow attempt and effort. This sequential pattern of growth is essentially the meaning of the psychological theory that learning takes place only when risks are taken, when failures are possible.

Too often in the past, traditional vocational education has aimed at achieving success in some marketable skill. The learning involved was not designed as growth, but as the prospect for growth which took place not in the present learning situation but in the future market place. Also, too

often the future market place materialized as something other than anticipated. Growth has been separated from learning and career living, and, what is worse, learning has led more often than not to a job that boxed out prospects for further growth into a dynamic, evolving career.

Generally, then this has been the sequence of education: learn first, then grow and live. A new sequence is demanded for living career education in which learning, like life itself, becomes a form of growth by incorporating risk and failure as well as effort and success in that order.

An educational pattern sequenced in this fashion will help overcome the fear of failure that, oddly enough, increases with maturity and experience in our society which over-values instant success. Mature people learn less, not because they have learned more or because for them there is less to learn. They learn less because they have been socialized to attempt less and to settle for less.

When as infants and young children we are learning more at a faster rate, it is, again, not because there is much to learn or because we have learned very little, but rather because we are in those times of greater innocence less contaminated by social pressures to succeed. For the child, failure is an acceptable part of experience. One of the finest qualities of childhood--a quality of child-likeness too often missed in the adult world--is what is what has been called the "courage to fail" (Gardner, p. 14).

Career education, then in order to maintain the sequence of growth, to open the future to yet unimagined prospects, must contribute to the restructuring of individual and social values to include the worth of risking failure, of making an effort against some odds. Herein is the basis of an ethic for

career education--Goethe voiced this ethic when he noted that as long as men are striving, we will also be making mistakes. It has often been claimed that tragedy is not in making our mistakes, but in the failure to learn from them. What may be truer is that little if any learning takes place except in making mistakes. And correcting them through self-diagnosis and further application of the "courage to fail."

But this is not an ethic familiar to the capitalistic and religious work ethics engrained in much of our tradition. Our materialistic culture rewards consequences, generally measured in terms of profit, not the unsuccessful effort, no matter how courageous. Furthermore, our religious culture rewards the effort, but not the risk-taking adventure that redirects or restructures experience.

Career education, then, faces some imperative to reward the risk-taking adventure that fails. Society in general must relearn the lesson of sequence--that risk and attempt precede learning and achievement. And for the American scene to relearn that lesson, career educators will have to take some big risks of their own.

For instance, if career learning is to be a form of life and growth, it must be valued and accordingly rewarded by the society which will profit by that career. Learning is not just a child's game, and education cannot much longer remain America's babysitting chore. If learning, like productive work, becomes sequential growth through risk and effort, then the resources of society must be shared with the learner as well as the producer. In the highly complex and technical society of the American

twentieth century, career learning is no longer just a privilege to be allowed by society. It is a necessity to be paid for by society. When a forty or fifty year old man or woman is no longer growing, his economic life ruined by obsolete skills which once promised freedom, his courage to fail through risk and further effort must be encouraged by society's willingness to pay for growth learning as well as for productive work.

The Flow of Experience

Furthermore, the growth sequence of risk and failure, of effort and success, which requires precious time, will have to expand learning spacially as well as temporally beyond the classrooms, laboratories, and school shops into other domains of living and growth--into the homes, businesses, trades, community projects and industry.

The "outward" movement of career development will threaten those educators who have used the schools as a false protection from failure.

Abstraction, a "drawing away" or "separation," is a mental process or logical method of dealing with complex experiences by considering their qualities or attributes separately in order to understand them better. But life itself does not come wrapped in neat packages of logical meaning. Experience flows. Time is not composed of discreet moments that begin and end between other disconnected points of time. In reality, the experiences of life have no beginning or endings. Nor do we find our socio-physical environment, on careful thought, to be made up of unrelated, distinct objects. The ecological concern of today is reminding us that every aspect

of our environment stands--or flows--in marvelous inter-relationships. The medical profession has long been aware of the effects of mental attitudes on our bodily functions. Where does "mind" end and "body" begin? For that matter, where does "self" leave off and "society" begin? Even if we have trained ourselves to see reality in discreet, abstract parts, these questions, taken seriously, remind us that life is a continuity of experience.

The notion of continuity is the second aspect of growth that education for a living career must incorporate. This quality of experience emphasizes the uninterrupted connections and inter-relationships of causes and effects, of efforts and results, of ideas and actions. Were it not for the flowing continuum of consciousness, we would be unable to maintain self-identity as we perform different functions at different times in different places. Without an awareness of the continuing relationships of experiences and objects, there could be no memory or goal-directed behavior.

Yet, despite this fundamental principle of the continuity of experienced reality, educators continue defensively to stake out private empires in the world of learning. Some mark off a special age level at which, supposedly, learning occurs differently than at other levels only to convince us that there must be some age level at which learning is no longer possible or profitable.

Other educators claim rights to special subject matters, leaving the impression that the content of learning must always carry with it the authority of logical organization. Learning becomes the absorption of that content and the recall of that organized structure, as if the function of

intelligence were to contain the existing rather than construct the becoming. To master the subject has often meant to be subjected to the fixed structure of thought, as if the knowledge of reality could not be viewed in any other legitimate way. "All Gaul is divided into three parts."

Science educators see themselves disconnected from the arts, yet surely something like creativity or imagination or a daring sense of adventure necessary to both demands that we view science and art as existing in interaction on one and the same continuum.

Some vocational and technical educators consign themselves and their students to the ridicule of substandard academics by arguing for the necessity of getting the job done, while some philosophers never learn the meaning of their theories, disconnected from work and practice and social action.

Career education faces the challenge of our culture--the challenge of seeing the continuity of learning and growth, of self and society, of mind and body, of theory and practice--in short, the continuity of head and hand.

Our nation is currently involved in one of the most remarkable social experiments in the history of mankind--the integration of peoples of various races with divergent cultural backgrounds without destroying indigenous life-styles and values of minority groups. Economic threats appear to be the greatest obstacles to delayed success. Nevertheless, one wonders if the lessons of civil rights, social justice, and cultural pluralization have not been more difficult than they would have been if the deeper truth of continuity of growth and experience had not been foreign to our thought.

If so, the concept of continuity provides career education with

multiple social and educational opportunities. Children can be taught that learning is not the drudgery of childhood but the continuing responsibility and thrill of all of life. Young people will learn that, in accordance with the continuity of experience, they cannot drop out without also "dropping into," -- moving into some novel situation or experience. Experiences that unfortunately lead to failure become the means to success in valid career education. Jobs that close down through obsolescence and automation become times for new learning without the disgrace of unemployment, for the only suitable human employment is that of learning. Older people will know that retirement is not a domain of uselessness. Individuals of all walks of life and aspirations can be taught to choose for themselves different levels of attainment at different times without undue social pressures or recriminations.

Career education, means growing--not necessarily up the ladder--but along a continuum where the disconnected "ups" and "downs" become the interrelated "ins" and "outs." Career education is growth toward ever-increasing responsibilities to others and self in continuing interaction.

Daily we read of medical doctors who become dairy or chicken farmers, university professors who leave prestigious campuses for ghetto nursery schools, engineers and architects who leave lucrative professional practices to drive trucks or work in machine shops. Our first reaction is to judge that the kitchen got too hot for such "dropouts." Or are they just lazy, over-educated good-for-nothings. Perhaps Parkinson's law caught up with them--they had succeeded to a level of incompetency.

These judgements fail to act on a viable concept of career as continuing growth. Career in its best sense allows--even encourages--failure that eventuate success, withdrawals that recoup for advancement, departures along courses yet to be socially chartered. Of course, ideally we want everyone to do his best and to be educated to his fullest capacity. Dogmatically, however, we want everyone to do his best, and to receive the best education, as we see it. Above all, career education faces the challenge of developing the concept of continuity of self-interests and social expectations. A career does not just belong to one person; a career is that person. But that career can be lived only among other careers, other persons. A career, then, must contain two qualities--self-choice and other-consciousness. These two qualities ultimately exist in a career, however, only as one, when the continuity of learning and living, self and society, are asserted.

The concept of career as sequential and continuous growth harbors some potential dangers to career education, however. Given the history of our national experience with education, it is safe to predict that, as career education seeks new directions and a new dynamic, the notion of fixed sequence along the learning-living-working continuum will re-emerge. Because of vested interests, pet theories, or traditional paths in educational experience, some will more than likely prescribe/set patterns for all or most career learning. Rapid steps of development will define beforehand the sequential experiences through which every person must necessarily move toward career success, as if there really were some fixed order to human development.

Based on the antiquated concept that reality is fixed, or that the

natural processes of reality are pre-ordered, some have with great success convinced the world of learning that specific stages of human growth must inevitably follow one upon the other. But more recent interpretations of the nature of reality and human development afford no guarantees that there are sure and certain paths to human maturity and socio-economic success. Also, the social sciences indicate that sequences of human development are culturally influenced, so that progress and success are relative to social and individual interpretations.

For career educators, this understanding means that patterns of career education must be designed individually--and with the individual's cultural background and social context in mind. It means that an appropriate sequence for one may not be adequate for another. Even more demanding, this need to invent rather than impose sequence means that learners must be taught to participate in deciding the best order of learning and working experiences. The appropriate place to learn career design is in a career education program which is itself being designed by the consummer. A career education sequence which does not allow the learner to evaluate and revise his own stages of development cannot provide the necessary basis for future career design.

The individualization of career learning raises the difficult question of equalization with which our society is justly now concerned. If learning sequences differ on an individual basis, will not some have greater learning opportunities and therefore greater career chances than others? Unfortunately, the movement toward the individualization of

learning has been thwarted by our interest in equal educational opportunities. But even Aristotle, living in an age of elitism coupled with slavery, recognized 2500 years ago that to treat different people equally, though they are equal in political and economic claims, is to treat them unequally. Thus, equal educational opportunities depend upon individualizing career instruction according to personal background, interests, needs and aspirations of the learners.

II. MOBILITY AND THE KNOWLEDGE ECONOMY

Career Mobility

Technological changes soar through our advanced economy. Whole industries rapidly become outmoded; new ones are created almost overnight. Unskilled and semi-skilled laborers are compelled to leave their homes for new jobs--for some an excruciatingly painful ordeal. Nevertheless, the future economy is expected to demand yet greater mobility, placing the responsibility upon career education to foster increased stability of personality and flexibility of behavior. The future belongs to the adaptable, the mobile and the flexible. Those who are immobile psychologically will likely be economically immobile also.

As a consequence of new technologies, there is expected to be a sharp rise in job turn-over and career changes. A twenty-year-old can anticipate six or seven job changes during his "serial career." The worker of the future will be identified, not in terms of his present transient work, but according to the overall pattern of his evolving career. Any attempts to identify and project the many potential career patterns in our rapidly changing economy will require the sharpest consciousness of the future.

As that future brings ever greater degrees of obsolescence into vocations, education and careers, experience has less and less advantage over knowledge. Accordingly, it may become essential to plan and educate for some careers in which the peak of responsibility is reached relatively

early, followed by tasks requiring less up-to-date specialized knowledge yet greater experience. In such cases, obviously our social criteria for success must be drastically redefined.

Whatever the cycles or patterns, career transience and job turn-over are already educating many to value less those institutional loyalities, human affiliations, geographical roots, and physical possessions which hinder mobility and flexibility. Whole new life-styles and value patterns are evolving which demand career preparation as sophisticated in its psychological and aesthetic dimensions as in its vocation. With respect to all those elements in which humans have learned to ground their lives in security--in people, places and possessions--we are now required to operate at a rate of change and adaptability never before required. In a transient society characterized by job mobility and serial careers it will become virtually mandatory to accelerate the processes of learning, adapting, relating, and innovating as well as relinquishing.

"In administrative structure. . . we are moving from long-enduring to temporary forms, from permanence to transience" leading to a "revolutionary shift in power relationships" (pp. 122-123). Demanding rapid communications among workers at the same levels, technological innovations are breaking traditional chains-of-command. Bureaucratic hierarchies find it more and more difficult to separate the decision-makers at the top from those who carry out the decisions below. If this trend away from vertical to lateral communications continues, career education must reverse any significant efforts to process the compliant worker who knows best to do what others have decided. Future careers and organizational relationships will reward

better those who have skills in communicating and making rapid decisions with those with whom they work. Of course, this approach to career education requires a philosophical reorientation away from the basis of traditional vocational and technical training programs which assumed that workers below could not make sound decisions. After hundreds of years the electronic, nuclear and genetic innovations are accomplishing what the agricultural and industrial revolutions could not--the actual as well as the theoretical unification of thinking and doing, of mind and body, of head and hands.

From this perspective, automation and technology are not the dehumanizing forces they are sometimes seen to be by some social critics. Time-consuming, immobilizing bureaucratic practices that draw strict lines of distinction between leaders and followers are faltering, and from every indication will continue to give way to greater decision-making responsibilities among workers who are prepared to assume greater degrees of self-management. It is the challenge to career education to help realize these democratic potentialities by training leader-workers, not just workers. Instantly responsive organizational forms will differentiate the workers less according to rank, but more and more according to functions and knowledge. Career training, therefore, will require less commitment to semi-permanent work relationships than to increased skills in human interaction, problem-solving, and decision-making.

The technology of tomorrow requires not millions of lightly lettered men, ready to work in unison at endlessly repetitious jobs, it requires not

men who take orders in unblinking fashion, aware that the price of bread is mechanical submission to authority, but men who can make critical judgments, who can weave their way through novel environments, who are quick to spot new relationships in the rapidly changing reality. It requires men who--- "have the future in their bones" (Toffler, p.357).

Knowledge Careers

Applying ideas and information rather than manual skills or brawn to production, the "knowledge industries"will supply during the seventies one-half of the GNP. Now distinguished from the "primary" industries which make the products of nature available, and from "secondary" manufacturing, the knowledge industries are rapidly employing ever larger numbers of workers in making knowledge productive. The future demand for knowledge workers appears to be limitless.

The challenges and perplexities for career education growing out of the explosion of the knowledge economy are immense. First there is a lack of knowledge about knowledge workers themselves as well as their work: How is the knowledge career to be measured and rewarded? What are the psychological and social needs of the knowledge worker, and how are these needs best satisfied? How does the management and achievement of knowledge workers differ from that of the producer of goods? And what are the special educational requirements of the knowledge economy as distinguished, for example, from agriculture or assembly-line mass-production?

Secondly, there are the problems peculiar to the transition from

yesterday's manual work to the contemporary knowledge economy: 1) The application of knowledge to work threatens to return unskilled workers to a previous low status. 2) Traditional crafts become obsolete in a knowledge economy. And 3) the socio-economic gains made by the Negro population in the last quarter century are being reduced drastically by the shift to the knowledge economy (Drucker, pp. 287, 299-306).

Producing With Ideas and Concepts

The psychological requirements of the knowledge worker may also be taken as the requirements of learners preparing for knowledge careers. All useful learning is knowledge work. And since knowledge work is difficult if not impossible to quantify, the knowledge worker as well as the knowledge learner can be neither motivated nor rewarded by the quantity of work assigned or achieved. Undoubtedly the greatest mistake educators in all areas have ever made is to evaluate learning by the number of facts accumulated. "The merely well-informed man is the most useless bore on God's earth" (Whitehead, p.1).

Knowledge work cannot be motivated by external rewards but only from within. It is satisfying only to the extent that the worker's psychological and social needs for work have been developed to the level where they may be met by accepting a challenge and making a contribution. Furthermore, workers in the knowledge economy, unlike the unskilled laborer or even the skilled machinist, are challenged by the objectives of applying knowledge to a task. Therefore, they "require that the demands be made on them by knowledge rather than bosses . . . . They require a performance-oriented organization rather

than an authority-oriented organization" (Drucker, p. 289). Perhaps this principle is a key to organizing career education for knowledge careers.

While the knowledge worker considers himself to be a "professional," he is after all an employee, the present economic equivalent of yesterday's manual laborer. During their late forties or early fifties, therefore, many knowledge workers after twenty-odd years or so of successful career, realizing that their field of knowledge provided unattained heights become tired and bored, victims of despair. If they were manual workers, they would probably retire at this time of dwindling enthusiasm. But it is difficult to retire from knowledge work, for it is habit-forming and all-consuming. Consequently, the knowledge economy makes a strong demand on middle-aged workers to begin a second career.

Given these psychological dimensions and the rapid rate of technological obsolescence, retirement from the first knowledge career at 65 is far too late. But all too often educational programs for second careers require the experienced knowledge worker to start from the beginning and to learn everything from scratch. Previous experience, mature insight, and self-discipline and motivation count for nothing. Yet men with experience in one career or organization--desperately needed in some other interrelated endeavor--could and should be prepared in only a fraction of the time, with only a fraction of the effort, required to train inexperienced youth. Career educators will have to give up their coveted "prerequisites" in the case of second career trainees, and "the knowledge worker---will have to learn that there is no disgrace in starting over again at age forty-five" (Drucker, p. 296).

Problems for Career Education

The rise of the knowledge economy imposes special problems for career education (Drucker, pp. 299-310). Because the knowledge economy threatens to return unskilled mass-production workers to a previous low social, if not economic status, education directed to their particular needs is an imperative for America at this juncture. Increasing the speed of transition from machine and assembly-line work to knowledge work, in order to control that change, is one approach that has been advocated. Another is to teach those caught up in the transition how to cope with change.

> Unskilled work otherwise will become a trap. We must be able to encourage the individual...to become a knowledge worker himself. And we must be able to assure the individual who is an unskilled worker that, when his present job becomes obsolete, society will help him to find a job to acquire the necessary knowledge and skills for it, and to move to it (Drucker, p. 300).

Individual employers will not be able to accomplish this monumental task alone. Only a group of employers or the federal government in cooperation with unions and employers can provide the necessary means.

A second problem facing career education in light of the rapid increase in knowledge work is due to the fact that skills based on traditional crafts are obsolete. Craft skills learned through apprenticeships are no longer tenable in the knowledge economy, for they cannot serve the worker throughout his entire working life. On the other hand, skills that apply information and concepts in production and service change both often and rapidly. "To enable our society and economy to grow and protect the individual member of a craft or skill, we will have to liquidate the craft union and the craft

concept...not to abolish skill but to liberate it and make it truly productive" (Drucker, pp. 303 f.).

As the shift to the knowledge economy reverses the ascendancy of manual workers, the Negro in America with limited knowledge as the foundation of skill is the most likely to suffer. The immediate need is to provide intensive classroom training and knowledge skills such as mathematics and reading to Negro youths who see their limited opportunities reduced just as they are beginning to enjoy them. Immediate skilled or unskilled mass-production work for black youths may appear to be the greatest need. But in the long-run the good intentions of providing manual work, apart from knowledge career education, will hinder the Negro's search for equality and self-respect. Livelihood may be found in manual jobs, but equality and self-respect today are the products of the dominant knowledge society.

> However badly we need immediate mass production and craft jobs for the Negro, we need even more a massive effort to find, identify, develop, and place the largest possible number of Negro knowledge workers as early as possible. This means going into elementary schools...working with boys and girls at a very early age, helping them to plan careers, encouraging them to stay in school and to learn, showing them opportunities, examples, and models. It means going to the Negro family to encourage support for schools....it means making learning and teaching relevant and effective. It means also the development of programs....to give adolescents and even adults a second chance to put to use their native abilities (Drucker, p. 309).

The shift from craft-skills to knowledge work requires that the transition to the knowledge economy be accelerated, not retarded. Career education must accept the responsibility of gradually replacing manual jobs with knowledge careers. Such careers based on a knowledge foundation are more productive and satisfying. Their rewards--both economic and psychological--are greater for both the economy and the individual.

III. CONTROL AND CONDITIONING

The Interaction of Events and Ideas

The history of men can be viewed as the interaction of events and ideas. Each play upon the other to generate varying historical movements and cultural styles. Fluctuating events of human experience give rise to the need for new social directions or aims, problem resolutions or cultural values. These are supplied by new ideas about man, his nature and purpose, or his relationship and responsibility to the society. In turn, these new ideas stimulate or stifle, direct or misdirect human experience which provides their proving ground.

In broad generalities, human history has experienced three revolutionary interchanges between ideas and action which demanded the most of man's adaptability. The first, the agricultural revolution, brought man from a nomadic hunter to a settled farmer for whom territorial imperatives and threats of nature were of greatest concern. Of course, different skills were required, and different bases for dignity and success were defined.

Then man's ingenuity and continuing search for meaning and method gave rise to a second revolution, the industrial. The movement from nature to the depersonalized urbanization of human resources took man from a familiar environment to the "unnatural" sweat shop, factory and mill. New ideas motivated the industrial revolution, but new ideas also grew from it. Even before, during, and since, the concept of God changed from that of benevolent provider, imminent in nature, to a remote creator of a self-sustaining, automatic and mechanical universe. Men sensed their own greater responsibilities

in moving from the role of caretaker to that of producer. Nevertheless, we offset this increased sense of responsibility with the materialistic notion that our own machine-like nature responds uncritically and unavoidably to external stimuli beyond our control.

Even as the industrial revolution continued, with the growing suspicion that his fixed, mechanical world may not after all be prescribed by unchanging natural laws, man moved into the twentieth century nuclear revolution. Physical entities became fields of energy. Objective independent regularities and notions of a well-ordered universe began to give way to scientific hypotheses as explanations requiring periodic re-examination and re-interpretation. What was considered "given" to human intelligence now demanded intelligent reconstruction. The role of intelligence was no longer an accumulation of the certain and undoubtable, but the actualization of new realities, the human environment and even man himself. We are realizing, no matter how gradually, that the relativity of reality not only places us within the evolutionary process but, if that process is not predetermined by a pattern of automatic progress, we also possess the prerogative of directing it.

With typical humanity, the flight from responsibility has again thrown social, and therefore educational, goals into a frenzied tailspin. Conservative idealists dredge up notions of eternal verities and absolute values--which indeed would provide order and stability to our fluctuating society, but only at the cost of a sense of freedom.

The struggle for irresponsibility is always frustrated by the fear of losing freedom, just as the fight for freedom is thwarted by the fear of

increased responsibilities.

Genetic engineers lose man in a world of predetermined heredity void of both responsibility and freedom. Romantic naturalists revive laissez faire dreams of absolute individual freedom without any social responsibility. And evangelistic fundamental capitalists preach the responsibility of law and order with minimum freedom of individual expression.

Of particular current interest is B. F. Skinner's view of environmental determinism which denies autonomous self-hood and thereby avoids responsibilities of human freedom and dignity.

Conditioning, Culture and Career

Skinner calls for a science of behavior which would circumvent the "states of mind" of "autonomous man" in order to get "directly to the relation between behavior and the environment . . . ." (Skinner, p. 39). That relationship is causal: men do not freely choose their behavior; it is controlled by the environment with which they interact. As the science of behavior learns "more about the effects of the environment, we have less reason to attribute any part of human behavior to an autonomous controlling agent" (Skinner, p. 39).

The pre-scientific view of man, says Skinner, holds that behavior is one's own achievement for which one may be held responsible, praised or blamed. Science, on the other hand, provides a new concept of man whose behavior is controlled by environmental circumstances. Accordingly values reside ultimately not in human feelings, but in things within the environment which reinforce behavior positively. To modify behavior, therefore, we

must go beyond the inner sense of freedom, dignity, and responsibility to the environmental contingencies of reinforcement. By arranging social contingencies, the technology of behavior is capable of designing a whole culture, at least piecemeal.

> It is the environment that is "responsible" for the objectionable behavior, and it is the environment, not some attribute of the individual, that we must change . . . . What we must change is not the responsibility of autonomous man but the conditions . . . of which a person's behavior is a function (Skinner, p. 52).

In order to affect these changes, "we must delegate the control of the population as a whole to specialists" (Skinner, p. 72).

Fundamental to the inadequacies of "operant conditioning" is a misunderstanding of the function of science--which is to provide prediction and control that may free men from supposedly deterministic elements. (Skinner, p. 75).

Nevertheless, if the science of behavioral control can promise a utopia without conflict and punishment, it will be tempting to utilize its "ethically neutral" technology as a means of designing human careers, if for no other reason than the fact that freedom for many has been a small price to pay for the security of non-responsibility. But in mass society one's life or death, sickness or health, failure or success depends daily on hundreds of anonymous individuals. Social reality, therefore, is too interdependent to design human careers on deterministic philosophies of non-responsibility of controlled behavior.

Besides, our culture has already experienced the consequences of "the pursuit of ugliness" by technology expressed through the medium of

design" (Nelson, pp. 23, 22). The earlier designs of craftsmen, during the pre-industrial period, were created for the specific needs of identifiable persons. But today's dehumanized technological designs are prefabricated, not for any real person's needs, but for the anonymous consumer whose values and interests are conditioned by mass-media advertizements.

In this respect, Skinner's point is only too obviously true, and as Emerson said, "Things are in the saddle, and ride mankind." But the question for career education as well as for cultural design is not whether men can be controlled by the contingencies of reinforcement arranged in their environments for the purpose of manipulation. Obviously, we can be and are. Rather the prior question is whether we must or should be so controlled, or whether free individuals can and should also participate in the design of their own careers. And, further, whether individuals can and should develop and express a sense of dignity and responsibility through their careers. Only in this way can meaningful opportunities arise to redesign the influences culture brings to bear on each of us.

Other aspects of Skinner's technology of behavioral control and operant psychology provide some promising directions for career education. While it is true enough that man is controlled by his environment, it is also true that his environment is almost wholly his own making. If men, then, are the products of a controlling culture, it is a culture which man himself has designed. "The evolution of a culture is in fact a kind of gignatic exercise in self-control . . . . the individual controls himself by manipulating the world he lives in . . . . " (Skinner, p. 79). Whether we have

misread Skinner or whether his thought harbors an irreconcilable inconsistency is beside the point. The fundamental bases for career education are illuminated: career education can become the foundations of intentional cultural evolution. A person's career can be his or her role, no matter how minute, in redesigning the contingencies of reinforcement--or values--which define the quality and direction of human experience.

And Skinner, despite some unclear notions of social manipulation and environmental control, provides some practical observations and techniques by which this may be accomplished:

1) The theoretical separation of men and their socio-physical environments must be denied if the practical conditions of daily life are to be improved. Individuals do not become good (or bad) apart from the ways they respond to environmental contingencies.

2) The notion of human beings as "autonomous selves," absolutely self-determining and free from environmental controls, must be rejected in favor of the concept of man as a social being whose consciousness is a social product.

3) Control as such is not a necessary evil or threat to the individual. "The problem is to free men, not from control, but from certain kinds of control" (Skinner, p. 43).

4) Because behavior is affected by its own consequences, the contingencies that reinforce behavior can be redesigned to produce intentional cultural evolution.

5) The behavior of the controlled is as much controlled by the contingencies of the environment as the behavior of the controlled. Thus,

effective resistance to aversive control is possible by arranging effective countercontrols: assign the controller to the group controlled so that the consequences of his own behavior come to bear on the controller himself.

6) Men must learn to play two roles: a) the controlling designer of a controlled culture, and 2) the controlled product of a controlling culture.

7) A planned culture does not necessarily mean regimentation or uniformity. Diversification which reflects the value of variety may be planned.

The habit of Western mind to think in either/or terms is never more obvious than in questions of freedom and authority. To the individualism of the American spirit, social regulation often means dire threats to personal freedoms. Thus, the cultural conditioning of individuals appears as an obstruction to their control of life. But the concept of interaction between the controlling individual and his conditioning environment ought to be sufficient to refute the antithesis of individual freedom and social authority. Free men are not free because they do just what they want; such is not freedom but anarchy. We are free when we participate meaningfully in those social decisions and cultural directions by which we direct our own lives.

On these bases, career education has the opportunity to avoid the extremes of permissivism and authoritarianism, of individualism and absolutism, which have plagued all forms of education throughout our history. Furthermore, career education, working within such a theoretical framework, can teach the means whereby career and culture--self development and environmental conditioning--are mutually supportive rather than antagonistic.

IV. CONSCIOUSNESS

Nature vs. Society?

In his Discourse on the Arts and Sciences, Rousseau condemned the artificial social institutions of modern civilization for corrupting the inherent natural goodness of man, the "noble savage." Since that time, it has become a perennial intellectual past-time, and on occasion a violently political interest, to berate man's technological and industrial achievements. These romatic diatribes are usually based on the questionable assumption that the "contrived" environment of machines and social organizations is inexorably antithetical and diametrically opposed to natural man and his ascribed purposes. The conclusion often reached is that man cannot be at home in a world of his own making. The premises often over-looked is that men seldom have their own destruction in mind, that survival remains paramount to our interests, and that man by his very nature is a social being interacting with political institutions, economic processes, and other social realities.

Nevertheless, the enhanced survival of some can, has and indeed does limit the quality of the survival of others. This is only to state an obvious fact. Where we often go astray in asserting the fact is in assuming that there must be some "cause" in the form of "prescription" lying behind the facts of history and society which make them occur the way they must. Thus, the nineteenth century American economy was undergirded by so-called "natural laws" of the market place. Since individual pursuit of one's own economic interests was assumed to promote the well-being of the entire society,

there was little concern for the general welfare or the public interest.

Of course, it is now obvious, whether there are objective laws directing the marketplace or not, that individuals acting in their own interest "refused to remain individuals. Instead of competing against one another on equal terms for the good of all, they began to combine with one another in groups for their own exclusive profit" (Carr, p. 24).

Other economic prescriptions of the nineteenth century have also lost the force of natural law: the notions of "success" as "the natural reward" of inherent intelligence and social effort, and of "failure" as "the natural punishment" for laziness and idleness. Having realized that individuals competing for economic rewards do not start free and equal, we are now far more conscious of the fact that success is more a matter of economic and educational opportunities and social background rather than the unfolding of natural gifts or the manifestations of eternal or natural laws.

To cope with extreme scarcity and mass unemployment, due in part to the belief in the economic survival of the fittest, greater degrees of social and economic controls have emerged in the twentieth century quite contrary to our earlier laissez faire policy. It has become typical of Americans to assume that the problems of technology and the industrialized corporate state can be alleviated with more of the same; thus, our present technological dilemma. It is a society both confused and encouraged by the prospects of bigger and better machines in which new perspectives in career education must stand trial. It is also in this social milieu that Charles A. Reich outlined the prospects of a new revolution, the greening of America.

The Consciousness of Work

Reich has posited three attitudes, or consciousnesses toward life in general and work in particular. "Consciousness I" focuses on the self and the value of individual hard work. Essential concomitants of the ethic of individual effort are self-repression, social isolation, enmity with nature, and the competitive suspicion of others. Assuming that human nature is inherently evil, and that competitive struggle is the necessary relationship between man and man, and man and nature, "Consciousness I" assumes there will always be aggressive struggle for power.

While "Consciousness I" is fundamentally characterized by self-interest, "Consciousness II" works toward a common good through organized, coordinated activities arranged in the hierarchy of responsibilities and authorities. Each "individual should do his best to fit himself into a function that is needed by society, subordinating himself to requirements of the occupation or institution that he has chosen" (Reich, p. 76f). The man of "Consciousness II" denies his own personal feelings and values to adopt the standards set for him by his organization or occupation. There develops a split between the private or authentic self and the public or working self. The activities of life, including work, become disintegrated, since they are chosen from external sources or imposed from without. The organizational man is trained to become a mere occupation, to abandon all aspects of questioning, thinking, and feeling that contribute to neither production nor consumption.

"Consciousness III" is more difficult to define and summarize. It is less an ideology, more a methodology--a way of life, and entire culture to be lived rather than analyzed. Beginning with the individual self and the freedom to construct one's own values, "Consciousness III" rejects the value of conforming to external institutionalized standards. If every human being possesses absolute worth, then be yourself. Not only does "Consciousness III" not measure its own achievements in competitive comparisons with the accomplishments of others, neither does it judge others. It refuses to evaluate or classify people according to general standards. Furthermore, just as it is wrong to conform to the external expectations and values of others, it is equally wrong to manipulate others as means to one's own ends.

"Consciousness I," acclaims Reich, is out of date, its beliefs drastically at variance with reality. For instance, it still believes that success is primarily a matter of hard work and morality. It fails to realize that corporate institutions predominate individual life, and that social problems are caused by socio-economic conditions more than by personal evil. "Consciousness II" on the other hand, fails to see the unique individual behind the generalized organizational standards to which it commits itself. Although dedicated to liberal social reforms, "Consciousness II," tied to the rewards and standards of the organization, cannot afford to jeopardize status, and will therefore work only for those reforms pointed in the direction society is already going. In responding to the realities of technology and organization, "Consciousness II," Reich concludes, goes too

far in subjecting the individual to the value of technological progress, economic efficiency, material success, political power, and social status.

> Consciousness II . . . . pushed these values too far; it came to believe that the individual has no existence apart from his work and his relationship to society. Without his career, without his function, he would be a non-person; hence the terrible fear of failure in the competitive struggle; below the meritocracy is an abyss where people have ceased to exist altogether. Thus there is a loss of a sense of the reality of the self, apart from the way in which society judges self. And because of this, a sense of reality about organizations and society is lost as well (Reich, p. 90).

There is little doubt that Reich's criticisms of classical liberalism under the label of "Consciousness I" or his diagnosis of the moral and social breakdown under "Consciousness II" neo-liberalism will be particularly enticing to career educators, many of whom possess a Consciousness I "depression psychology" based on scarcity, or a Consciousness II reliance on organizational goals and rewards. One need not accept the theory in its entirety, however, in order to identify viable principles and patterns for career education. At least the suspicious competitive and aggressive self-interest of "Consciousness I" and the extreme emphasis on materialistic values attributed to "Consciousness II" point toward the need for new directions in education for future careers.

The character of career education is all important, since it makes possible or thwarts the kind of jobs for which a person may qualify in the future. But too often career education has become negative training--that is, training to relinquish those individual values and human interests that are not compatible with the occupation. A vocational school characterized by negative training violates personality, teaching the learner to be that

kind of person required by the economy instead of identifying and developing individual interests. These individual interests composing the authentic self are the true bases for future social service. A negative training school may not be "a brutal machine for destruction of self," as Reich claims (p. 150), but it does train toward alienation. Its product is a worker dominated by technique and training to fit the role provided by society. Thus, the "career" becomes a "role-prison," and the worker is enclosed by prescribed occupational relationships and goals.

The Transformation of Work

Contrary to much popular belief, the new generation of "Consciousness III" rejects neither technology nor work. It is technology that has reduced scarcity, making possible a renewed quest for self and community. Technology also provides the stimulation and variety on which self-renewal thrives.

What the new consciousness does unequivocally reject is the domination of man by machine and repressive employment relationships. It is neither work nor the machine that is rejected, but that kind of work that subordinates humanity to the machine. New concepts of work and career are therefore evolving. Career education has the opportunity both to respond to and direct the development of new patterns of work, for the meaning of work is derived from the nature of the worker as defined by his preparation for that work.

Reich identified three phases in the transformation of the concept of career: (1) De-institutionalization, (2) De-alienation, and (3) De-specialization. Underlying each process is the concept of "noncareer"--a vocation constantly being redefined by an individual's knowledge of his own self and how he can best serve society, rather than a job required or offered by society

to which the individual must fit himself.

> "...the individual must define his own career in his own terms. He must continually remake his definition as he learns more about himself and about his world. That does not mean, however, that a personal definition will not include careful training for competence and excellence. Indeed, the personal standard of excellence should be far higher when a person chooses his own work than when he passively follows a route that society has defined" (Reich, p. 401).

The first step in creating the noncareer is de-institutionalization, the freeing of one's values from the false status rewards and interests of the organization. When the interests and conventional goals of the institution replace individual values, not only are the workers alienated from their labor, but the quality of their products and services deteriorates, endangering the consumer and thus undermining the institution itself. Thus, career education has the double responsibility of persuading managers that the best interests of their business organizations are tied to the personal goals and aspirations of the worker, and, secondly, of teaching all levels of employees that self-knowledge and fidelity to one's own values are essential to the career of being human.

De-alienation provides a satisfying means of self-expression by reducing regimentation and increasing the degree of control an individual has over his own working conditions. Not every work effort can be "creative" or "intellectual," for even that level of work can become demeaning if unduly pressured. But many forms of drudgery can become "play experiences" when the worker is challenged rather than repressed and regimented. Thus, with novel concepts of work emerging, the career--or "non-career"--minded must be taught not only productive service skills, but the skill of self-direction through

control over the conditions and responsibilities of one's own labor.

When the individual personality is in view, we see more than just one interest, talent, or ability that can be meshed with a single vocation. On the other hand, when we focus on the social economy, we see skills rapidly shading into obsolescence, while novel services are constantly in demand with no one to provide them. Psychology and technology, therefore, both mandate varied and changing careers for all. Thus, the new concept of work calls for de-specialization--the pursuit of several careers, either at the same time or successively, whether or not the worker remains in the same institution or occupation. Technology has not only made the multiple noncareer feasible but also essential. And career education can avert the dangers of technological obsolescence and a waste of individual human resources by preparing the future worker to enjoy a variety of work experiences.

But not every work experience needs to be economically rewarding. After all, it is assumed by Reich, the worker of the future who undergoes the transformation of consciousness will not, cannot, be manipulated by the purely materialistic values of the corporate economy. But all careers--whether sequential or simultaneous--must provide psychic rewards. And for them to do so, career education must help the future worker to integrate the variety and diversity of careers into a single wholeness of life.

> Pursued separately. . .careers may add little to each other, producing a divided individual. But leisure, continuing education, and reflection will allow a person to find a way to integrate what he does. . . . The result will be diversity and wholeness; in which the different sides of a person's life all converse with each other (Reich, p. 406).

In the past, education has often been justifed by its economic values. This or that education, though costing society so much, eventually pays

private and public dividends beyond the initial investment. With increased questioning of materialistic values, this basis for career education has far less appeal, especially to the young and those who are developing "Consciousness III" perspectives. "What do I get out of this training program or that career?" is giving way to "What can I contribute and express of myself through this way of life." Career education will do well to search out justifying bases for its programs and prospects that speak of humanistic more than materialistic values and emphasize self-giving more than getting. This too is a part of our broader and deeper cultural heritage whose time may have come at last.

Career by Consciousness

Far from being, then, the subversive, violent-prone movement suspected by some, the greening revolution of American culture, at least so far as work and career are concerned, provides a promise of value-conversions and self-renewal. The new consciousness and the values it holds are more responsive to human needs than to corporate, bureaucratic, or institutional interests. Accordingly, the coming revolution might be judged anti-establishment, and so it is, but not anti-social. For community "togetherness" is essential to the "revolution by consciousness." But it is a togetherness that encourages and enhances differences instead of denying individuality.

Consequently, the new consciousness does not pit the organized power of workers against the institutionalized power of the machine and technology. "It seeks to transcend science and technology, to restore them to their proper place as tools of men rather than as the determinants of man's

existence. It is by no means anti-technological, it does not want to break machines but it does not want machines to run men: (Reich, p. 383).

The critical responses to Reich's Greening have been many and varied (Green, pp. 505-512). Reich admits that his three forms of consciousness are mere created constructs. Did he invent them for his own hopes and purposes? Is Reich out of date? Is the greening revolution merely a fad? After all, the youth counter-culture is receding, and "graduates who once snubbed eager job-recruiters in order to seek 'meaning' in their lives suddenly are rediscovering the importance of work as they scramble frantically to find it in a tight job-market" (See "End of the 'Youth Revolt'? Survey of Changing Mood," U.S. News and World Report, Vol. 71, No. 6 (August 9, 1971), p. 26).

Furthermore, according to Herbert Marcuse, Reich is mistaken in asserting that no bureaucratic hierarchy, but mindless machines, control the corporate state. "There are very definite, identifiable persons, groups, classes, interests . . . which direct the technical, economic, political machine . . . . they, not the machine . . . have all the power . . . . (Marcuse, quoted by Green, pp. 510 f).

Other serious criticism and arguments have been leveled at Reich's theory of social change and his lack of economic strategy. Nevertheless, his diagnosis of our social dilemmas may suggest alternatives that career education dare not overlook, even though his prescription for non-violent revolution by the reconstruction of consciousness may harbor theoretical inconsistencies and practical inadequacies. What comes out of Reich's

thesis is the clear mandate for career education that self-support is nothing without self-direction.

Take for instance, the "Consciousness III" attitude toward career identified by the rejection of status goals, hierarchial positions, material security, and social power. Such values are rejected not because they are immoral but because they "have no real relationship to personal growth, self-satisfaction or happiness" (Reich, p. 257).

Again, the new consciousness does not envision a career to escalate according to the traditional linear patterns. For "Consciousness III" people, the meaning of life is not found in getting the right training for a good job and settling down to enjoy institutional rewards. Life is a whole series of choices and goals, and the career will be constantly changing --"the many different experiences, some planned, some fortuitious that one might have" (Reich, p. 258).

This approach to career and to the degrading forms of work requires an anti-competitive personality far different from the aggressive, disciplined consciousness that can be bought off merely with economic rewards for attaining unauthentic institutional goals. If career education takes seriously the immeasurable value and human dignity of each individual, if it abhors the repressive forces of a mass society in which work has become meaningless for many, then it cannot be satisfied with training skilled workmen to fill their pre-assigned slots in the productive economy. Career education faces the imperative of laying the basis for continuing self-development and the re-evaluation and reconstruction of values.

When faced with the imperatives before, education in all its forms and purposes has responded by indoctrinating prescribed values, so that the individual might more easily adjust to external demands. This remedy has become the cure that is worse than our social ills. Career by consciousness demands an education that teaches one how to evaluate and order his own values so as to direct his own development, not what values and beliefs of others to hold in order to succeed in a competitive economy.

In a society as disrupted as ours today, mutually exclusive and antagonistic ideological authorities cannot long continue to vie for the minds of men. Men must be prepared to decide their own futures, to choose their own values. This process of self-determination is possible only when social and educational directions evolve from a methodology of free inquiry, deliberation, and persuasion. Since "the methodological component is the crucial and definitive element in any system of educational authority compatible with the maintenance of a free society" (Stanley, p. 184), career education has the responsibility of teaching the skills of evaluation as well as the skills of production.

V. PROCESSING PERSONNEL

Democracy promotes individual aspiration. When the individual realizes that democratic opportunities exist for him to contribute to his own well being and advancement, his aspirations for achievement rise. Furthermore, when such opportunities for self-direction and achievement become actualities, not just mythical dreams, the individual in the democratic context allows himself still greater aspirations.

On this basis, Burton Clark and others have concluded that "the open society...is likely to remain...democratic only if...its lower classes have some reasonable degree of access to the educational avenue...leading to social rewards" (Clark, p. 75).

The question remains, however, as to whether educational achievements or ascribed social positions determine to the greater extent one's chances for sharing social rewards. Historically it can be demonstrated that the role of American education has been primarily that of assigning to the younger generations social positions similar to those of their fathers and grandfathers. This fact is not to discount the historical role of education in the lives of some who found the availability of schooling and training means of mobility to higher economic and social strata. Nevertheless, until the twentieth century, the schools reinforced the countertendency to stabilize social-class positions from generation to generation. Thus, until very recently the family socio-economic status, rather than education, effort and achievement, determined for the most part one's

economic mobility or lack of it, and his share of economic rewards.

For the last fifty years, however, our nation has experienced a series of complex and interwoven economic, technological and international pressures which have demanded more sophisticated skills, specialized experts and competent scholars. The consequences have been an extension and, in part, an equalization of education to larger numbers who are increasingly evaluated more in terms of their achievements than their ascribed social status.

But the extension of educational opportunities has its disadvantages, too. Mass education in America has not only produced a threat to academic standards, it has also resulted in the severe separation of the academic and the vocational as a false means of protecting those standards. Accordingly, the American school took upon itself in the twentieth century the function of sorting out the fates of human beings inside the classrooms. By awarding or withholding certification and diplomas, the schools sort the learners for various future on-the-job training.

Now, the romantic critics of American education describe this sorting as the mechanical, administrative-directed process of changing people into uncritical robots. Paul Goodman's criticism is typical and representative:

> The monkish and academic methods which were civilizing for wild shepherds create robots in a period of high technology. The public schools which did a job of socializing immigrants in an open society now regiment individuals and rigidify class stratification (Goodman, p. 100).

As the "great selector" that processes people into personnel, the schools reward those who follow instructions and learn to limit their initiative and creativity. Proper learning is defined by what the teacher wants; the students become disillusioned with a packaged world in which nothing is really what it appears to be. Many drop out; others turn to drugs or violence, while most adjust complacently to "packaged ideas, packaged entertainment, packaged products, packaged services, packaged lives" (Perkinson, p. 93).

The end product, therefore, of much vocational and technical education is a producer and consumer who has substituted packaging for, or confused packaging with, quality. Consequently, producers, unchecked by critical consumers and without quality-conscious workers, easily endanger the lives of others by pollution and threaten our society by wasting precious resources. But the producer is also victimized, for the packaging school-process also produces young workers who have little or no concern for the quality of their production or services. The worker behaves like a controlled, manipulated personnel, for that is what he is trained to be and that is the way he is treated. The work process and career as a whole are to be endured, not enjoyed.

Improvement under such conditions must be imposed from above by employers and managers, not for the improvement of quality of performance, but for the maximization of profit. Since such "improvements" must be imposed on apathetic or unwilling workers, the work itself becomes less meaningful and rewarding, and the workers are further alienated from their work.

Perkinson suggests that a critical approach to career education could change the economic function of schools drastically. This critical approach is based on the assumptions that our present economic system has faults and inadequacies which can, indeed must, be recognized, and that we, the consumers and workers, can improve the quality of work and therefore the quality of social existence. The improvement is possible, however, not from an authoritarian approach of power exerted from the top down, but through a critical dialogue which avoids confrontation but includes self-criticism. Career education concerned with the improvement of the quality of work and life must teach the critical appraisal of the world of work, not a passive acquiescence to it. Future workers preparing for careers in the world of work must move into that reality and engage it in critical dialogue.

Since much that is learned in formal vocational and career education rapidly becomes obsolete, more and more training is taking place in industry. Therefore, it would be easy to argue that it is the task of industry to provide quality improvements. The strength of that argument is reduced considerably, however, when one reflects on the sorting role of the school. Industry cannot employ for on-the-job training those who have no basic education. The schools, therefore, will continue to sort the young for various kinds and levels of on-the-job training.

Consequently, it will be in formal schools integrating basic education, academic studies, and vocational training in career education that the critical approach to work and consumption must be learned. Specifically, career education, by the following approaches, suggested by Perkinson, can prepare a person to participate critically and productively in the improvement of his own career as well as the economic and political conditions of society.

1) Abandon the authoritarian approach. Adult methods of manipulating, exploiting, and victimizing have been so institutionalized that criticism is considered subversive. But the new group consciousness of youth demands a world open to criticism, without paternalism.

"The current cry for a 'relevant' curriculum is but another manifestation of this revolt against that authoritarianism that says, 'this knowledge is of most worth--you must learn it, and accept it'" (Perkinson, p. 103).

2) Avoid the opposite of authoritarianism--a subjective relativism that glorifies personal whim. Having abandoned the authoritarian position, some career education programs, moving to the opposite extreme, already encourage students to work out their own conclusions about socio-economic conditions. Any conviction or persuasion is as good as another if one authentically commits himself to it as his very own.

Such individualism that rejects critical rationalism results in a self-indulgence that obscures the possibilities of rigour and social improvements. Furthermore, a relativism judged solely on personal whim provides no basis for the resolution of differences except violence.

3) Criticism--whether of the career education program or of the world of work to which it leads--must bring dialogue, not confrontation. It is not a question of decision-making power, but the opportunity of all affected by a decision to discuss and judge its merits and faults with a guarantee that decision-makers will respond to those criticisms. Education has fit a person only for manipulation and paternalism unless it has provided

the intellectual base on which to critize rationally and effectively, without prejudice, the decisions that affect his training, work and career. The place to begin is in the educative process itself. "All who attend these schools, all whose lives are affected by the schools, must have the freedom and opportunity to criticize their policies, practices, and procedures." (Perkinson, p. 114).

4) Focus on the enterprise or institution as it now exists. Too much emphasis has already been placed on goals when there is no agreement on the goals. We can ideals that have not yet been realized be improved. The appeal to non-existent ideal goals, no matter how worthy, rests on an infallible authority--which itself does not exist. The critical approach, on the other hand, allows for the evaluation of existing programs and systems, inadequacies and inconsistencies can be discovered and gradually removed.

(One might argue that educational goals provide necessary criteria for the existing curriculum or program. But programs judged in terms of their objectives evaluate them vacuously before the fact. Consequences, not objectives, provide matter-of-fact criteria for evaluation.)

5) Reform is gradual and piecemeal. The critical approach to career development and socio-economic improvement, based on the recognition of the fallibility of man and his institutions, recognizes that no reform can be perfect. Opportunity must be allowed, even provided, to learn through our mistakes. The alternative of total reform is based on the false assumption of perfection and leads to force against which the underveloped life has no recourse.

6) Insist on personal responsibility and self-criticism. Everyone involved in career education has some area of responsibility and control. The critical approach directs us to these areas which can be improved through self-criticism and an openness to the criticisms of others. Strategies of radical reform which take on the whole establishment direct attention away from personal responsibility to "the impersonal, almost cosmic forces over which the individual can exercise little or no control..." (Perkinson, p. 116).

7) Decentralize! There is no omniscient source of improvement for the entire system "at the top." This centralist approach, like the radical and totalitarian approaches, weakens initiative and dulls personal responsibility. It also increases bureaucratization that converts people into programs.

The value of decentralization, however, is not in localizing control, for this, too, would lead to confrontation and violence. Decentralization must do more than "lower" the authoritative power to a new "top." It must free initiative and responsibility from infallible authority so that personal responsibility for educational and social improvements through critical dialogue can be assumed by those at the local level.

Career education, the improvement of the educational system, and the betterment of our society requires an institutionalized critical strategy. We can improve our schools, our careers, our economic institutions if, on the basis of human fallibility which recognizes present inadequacies and injustices, we minimize these wrongs through criticism. Not through

defensive authoritarianism, violent confrontation, or whimsical non-involvement, but through interpersonal rational dialogue that places the responsibility for improvement on each individual to point out and acknowledge inadequacies.

VI. CULTURE

Absolutes, Science and the Individual

The intellectual foundations of modern man have failed. This loss of a sense of purpose and direction is true whether we look to traditional world views of absolutism, reconstructing methods of science, or the subjective values of individualism. The deterioration of moral and intellectual postulates is partly due to the competition which these three forms of thought have given one another as well as to the social conditions and innovations discussed above.

Certainly there is no question but that familiar cosmic absolutes have been threatened by the emergence of contemporary behavioral and social science as a method of redirecting social experience and reconstructing social realities. The concept of "work" as eternal punishment if not an essential absolute for man is a case in point. "Laws of the marketplace," thought to pre-determine economic directions, have been relegated to the position of scientific and therefore relative and changeable interpretations of the way events generally occur, rather than eternal laws which prescribe the course human history must take.

On the other hand, science has emphasized experimental social problem-solving, the public verification of knowledge by contextual consequences, and the collective endeavor of the intellectual community. With these emphases, to a dangerous if not devastating degree, science has lost sight of the individual man with his personal interests, needs and aspirations. For valuing the empirical base of science and its constant requirements for experimental intelligence, larger numbers of democratically oriented individuals are resisting the tendency of science to reduce man to the status of a bio-social animal (Soderquist, pp. 20-32).

Furthermore, science is apparently experiencing unforeseen failure in its efforts to define for men their values, causes and ideals which provide purpose and meaning in human life. A mere methodology is incapable of providing the securities of knowledge and understanding which only an ideology can provide.

Accordingly, it hangs appropriate to hypothesize that the three sources of human values and social ideals--cosmic absolutes, the method of science, and the subjective feelings of the individual--have in the twentieth century been thrown into such conflict with one another that theoretical guidelines for career education must be reformulated.

At best these new guidelines will circumvent the simplicities of education as either an input from without or an unfolding from within. Just as we do not bring our career talents into the world with us, neither can these talents be simply given by career education apart from social experience. Once the duality of the objective and the subjective realities is rejected, the false notions of innate individual "gifts" and pre-ordained "destinies" can be swept aside. Then career education can get to the matter of relating social beings to the world of careers without subjective either to the other. When the purely objective input no longer threatens the purely subjective output, and vice versa, career learners will have a basis for preparing for the world of work that is every bit as much a world of self-expression.

To Make a Difference

Man is, then, a product of his own times--the social institutions, movements and ideas that make up his cultural milieu. Though not necessarily predestined by our own social environment, we are in a real way a cultural product of traditions and their current fluctuations.

We are so interwoven with our environments that it is impossible to identify the line of separation between self and society, between the

"subjective" and the "objective." However, this linkage between being and experience, between man and his temporal context, has not always been appreciated. Most of our intellectual history has been colored with the notion that humanity is separate and distinct, and in earlier times considerable scholarly effort was made to identify and locate the distinguishing characteristics or essence which set humanity apart from the evolutionary changes and uncertainties of natural and social processes.

This effort to separate, even protect, from the capricious and arbitrary is understandable in light of the fact that prior to the nineteenth century men did not trust their own senses to describe the temporal context, nor, until the nineteenth century, was there an experimental method of science by which to control the directions of social experience. Thus, in the pre-empirical and pre-scientific era, men felt themselves victimized by natural and cosmic forces believed to be beyond their control. Furthermore, human nature and reality, including social and economic conditions, were easier to view as fixed if man himself had no means of making any real differences in his own environment or directing his own experiences.

Men became stuck in the false comforts of resolution until, gradually, faith in human ability to know by means of sense observation and experimentation were aroused by the dreams of self-determination and self-direction.

But only less than a century ago did we fashion thoroughly the notion that logical reasoning and sense observation are not diametrically opposed, but can be mutually supportive in the experimental process of testing hypotheses to direct our social experience and control our physical environment. With the advent of the behavioral and social sciences, even the masses of men dared to let their democratic aspirations soar, and especially so in America where the pragmatic thrust to get the job done held sway.

Still, the residue of uncriticized traditions left formidable problems, and the rise of science and democracy brought conflicts with previously

unquestioned authorities. Can a merely human methodology adequately direct experience and control the environment? Does man possess the prerogative of re-assessing values and creating new ones to match the novel demands of his time? How can we cope with the evolving problems of the post-industrial, nuclear age when the wisdom of past ages advises man to accept, to acquiesce, to comply with the inevitable? Should education adjust man to what is and must be, or can men learn to adjust reality to their own needs and interests, and thereby design their own futures?

These are meaningful questions no longer reserved for leisured, contemplative theoreticians. They are now the prime concern of the politically alert masses. To a great extent the answers provide the motivating foundations of career education, and career programs must provide opportunities to raise such questions. Otherwise, the promises that vocations, professions, and careers in general are unfulfilling devices to control the masses will continue to grow.

The Dignity of Work

As technology reduces the physical strain and toil of life, it also reduces the value of work as a source of dignity, self-respect and manliness. Perhaps this is the reason why so many vocational educators as well as labor leaders have been threatened by automation. Automation has been cursed as a "job killer," despite growing evidence that the movement from manual and semi-skilled labor to computerized technology creates demands for more products and services, and therefore a larger number of jobs.

Automation might also be damned as a change agent, for, as the longshoreman-philosopher Erik Hoffer correctly states, change is an ordeal. But this is only partial truth, for we also thrive on certain kinds of change, especially those we believe ourselves to be initiating or partially controlling.

It is, then, the qualities of change that we find arduous--or exhilerating--or, more than likely, something in between these extremes. So it is with automation, depending on specific individuals in particular situations.

A more realistic explanation, therefore, for the fears of automation may lie in the fact that it removes, or at least lessens, our sense of personal worth achieved through physical skill and manual labor. A sense of pride and dignity is generated by praise and credit. Until the recent past, most men--and women, too, in certain demanding pioneer or austere conditions--earned the admiration of others, and thereby their own self-respect, through dangerous, exhausting labor. Human dignity, previously gained through hard work, is threatened by technological advances which now require a new base for the achievement of social recognition and a sense of personal worth.

But man seek freedom as well as the praise of others, the economic rewards that accompany that praise, and self-respect. And technology, along with science, has been one of the major sources of freedoms we highly value--leisure time, mobility, comfort, longevity of life, instantaneous communications and, in general, freedom from physical stress and strain. In winning these freedoms, then, we have lost the dignity based on labor. "In this conflict, however, freedom usually wins out over dignity. We have admired people for submitting to danger, hard labor and pain, but almost everyone is willing to forego the acclaim for doing so" (Skinner, p. 49).

Unless we are willing, then, to give up either freedom or dignity, technology and the resultant loss of labor-based personal worth demand that we identify a new foundation, a new source, of the sense of human worth for career education.

The traditional vocational educator could, and no doubt did--or still does--appeal to his students' yearning for the physically difficult, dangerous,

and demanding if not painful. The entire system of rewards and credits has been reinforced by cosmic notions of the inevitability and ultimate value of suffering. Suffering became an opportunity to surpass human finitude and assuage guilt through deserved punishment for inherent depravity. But with his scientific accomplishments, man has taken a new look at himself. Justifiably or not, we perceive ourselves increasingly in control of our environment and our future. Finite we are, to be sure, but limited by context, not creation.

And a large part of these human limitations are reflected in the weakened base of human dignity. The easy way out of the dilemma is to claim that education of the right sort will in itself provide the individual with a sense of personal worth. Intermittently, this has been said repeatedly by those through the ages who saw education as an end-in-itself, requiring neither justification for its expenditures of time and energy nor application to the problematic affairs of men. Education, of whatever sort, does not create individual worth, however; rather we educate the individual because he is potentially worthy and, therefore, deserving of an education that enables him to perform successfully--that is, usefully--in human affairs.

But when men gave up their medieval notions of a constantly defined human nature, opening themselves up to evolutionary processes, the notion of natural worth--guaranteeing the value of the individual as a part of humanity--also became unworkable and untenable. If men are not inherently evil, neither are we naturally good. The value of the individual man, then, must emerge in social experience and be judged by criteria that respond to the changing needs and demands of that space-time context.

When, in order to survive, societies require military might, men make their claim for credit and gain dignity through undaunted courage and unquestioning obedience. But when the rise and fall of nations are held in

balance by nuclear power, the battlefield sacrifice of the individual foot-soldier seems useless and foolish to him, though his conscientious objection and refusal to enter combat are to others disloyalty, cowardice and treason. When survival--or even the enhancement of human experience--demands the sacrifices and sufferings of manual labor, those most willing and able to exert their physical powers and skills are held in greatest esteem, and these reap the personal satisfaction of dignity, though rarely if ever the lion's share of economic rewards. But when man's own tools exert greater power and his own technology creates wealth in himself, there is no cause of pride or worth symbolized in the never-ending blue collar.

Career education alone cannot solve the problem of lost dignity. Industry and organized labor must accept their share of responsibility in re-ordering "work" so that whatever necessary forms of manual labor remain are combined with more psychologically rewarding technical skills. In a society searching for the most degree of equality and interrelatedness of rewards (for the first time in history human talent promises to exceed the demand for it), there is even something to be said for "mixed careers" in which artistic creativity, professional intelligence, technological skills, and manual labor are mixed in varying degrees to the individual's ability. Through variety, each career activity would be a restful preparation for the others, "levels of incompetency" eliminated, tedious regimentation more broadly shared, and socio-economic status less likely assigned by arbitrary power.

But career education cannot justly escape its immediate responsibilities while waiting for other large social forces to refashion the broad structure of the world of work. Societies have a tendency to use what resources are available, a tendency which is at the same time both threatening and promising. The use of human resources, tools and technology merely because they are available is to define social ends, not by deliberate rationale, but by

arbitrary means. In this manner, nations have fought wars not just to champion great causes, repel aggression, or attain some predefined objective, but to expend an over-supply of military power, an unproductive population, or an obsolete or floundering economic system. On the other hand, by making new resources available, a society grants the opportunity to achieve deliberately designed social aims. Thus, the resources created through career education will help shape future social realities just as means influence the quality of the ends they achieve.

Accordingly, career education has its role to play in re-establishing the basis for human dignity and personal worth in whatever is required by the broad social goals emerging in our national and international experience. In a democracy, no single interest group possesses legitimate authority to define social aims, but certainly organized labor has the responsibility to take bold leadership in helping the world of defining the future realities of a society beset with transient policies and controversial goals.

Here, again, the expanded dimensions of career education beyond skill instruction are evident. A sense of personal worth cannot be created any longer on the basis of expended physical effort or learned skills alone. Dignity is the possession of that worker who understands and appreciates the contribution of his skilled efforts to social objectives reaching beyond his own time. Furthermore, personal worth comes with the realization that the quality of one's talents and resources is a contribution to the critical re-evaluation of those social objectives. Career education must, therefore, teach the ability to recognize broad social needs and objectives and, even more so, the ability to shape those needs and objectives by creating novel skills, tools and careers.

Survival and Identity

Work and education, like most social phenomena, reflect and re-inforce cultural conditions, especially social ideologies and patterns of thought. The dualism of mind and matter expressed in the separation of theory and practice, of thinking and working, is not the only philosophic disposition affecting outmoded patterns of career education. The dualistic strain of thought exposed in our typical either/or linear thinking also exposes itself in our failure even to imagine future worlds alternatives to capitalism and communism, to individualism and collectivism, to subjective value and objective absolutes.

Most of the theory and retooling of all forms of education today is bolstered by a "depression psychology" that clings to terms of the scarcity of resources--human and natural. The aim of most career education, education and career included, continues to be survival, despite the emergence of technology and industry conceivably capable of satisfying man's basic material wants, our goal remains fastened to the production and consumption of material goods which are less and less able to provide psychic gratification.

Granted, there are millions in our rich affluent society still existing in poverty. But this fact is not indicative that man's major task remains survival through conflict and competition. Some social critics sees poverty not as a result of continued scarcity but, in light of the capabilities of science and technology, rather a failure to conceive of and implement new social values and economic theories. In a complex, corporate society, of course, the implementation would occur through educational practices of whatever organizations and institutions will benefit, and through the schools and training centers designed by society to put its values and beliefs to work.

Given a transient society beset by novelty and social crisis, traditional values and beliefs are being questioned, even overthrown by new authorities

and enhanced by democratic aspirations. Newer modes of thought--beyond familiar dualisms and absolutes--are meeting the resistance encountered by all change in human relationships--or the novel values and beliefs are still being worked out on the dueling board of experience. The crises, the innovations, the indecision, the lack of clear social goals and educational aims all point to the very strong probability that our culture is undergoing significant transformation.

One interpretation of this new dimension of insanity, that of William Glasser, sees in the last few decades the emergence of civilization into a new "identity society" "in which the mores, values, and goals of a hundred centuries are being profoundly altered" (Glasser, p. 26). For the past 10,000 years, man's major priority was group survival through conquest and competition. Goal-orientation focused on what dictated and justified the means employed--aggression, slavery, alienation, conquest. To survive in this goals-oriented society, "man relinquished much individuality and became subservient to the group. Work became necessary, and strong men, to ensure their own survival, forced or persuaded others to labor for them. The control by one man of other men was common to this society" (Glasser, p. 28). The innate need for cooperation for common good, built into human nature through hundreds of thousands of years, has thus been denied for ten millennia, and the resultant stress focused in our own times.

For the most part, our social institutions, including education, operate to preserve the goal-orientation toward survival, based on the questionable assumption that aggression, but not cooperation, is an inherent human quality. Nevertheless, recently a surprising number of people--mainly the young, but older people as well--have begun to express themselves in the pursuit of a role independent of the goal of survival. "Moving against the accumulated inertia of centuries, these people are trying to gain a successful identity--

a pleasurable belief in themselves and in their own humanity and in the companionship of others in ways not necessarily related to security" (Glasser, p. 30). According to this interpretation, our social crises and conflicts cannot be adequately interpreted in terms of a generation gap. The emergence of the "identity society" signals a conflict of cultures.

Those within the identity society, instead of aiming for survival and security, instead of emphasizing material values and the acquisition of physical possession through conflict and competition, instead of defending themselves against questionable scarcities--those within the identity society concern themselves with human rights and privileges, including those of pleasure, inter-relationships, companionships, communication, individuality and self-respect. Instead of being dominated by the goal of survival and the need for security those within the identity society, otherwise referred to as the "counter culture," search out novel roles and relationships by which they might identify themselves, express themselves, and verify their humanity. The search for involvement, identity and independence, whose role is primary to goal, lessens the concern for security and weakens the power of dehumanizing hierarchies sustained merely--or mainly--by the survival goal.

The implications of this cultural revolution for career education and vocation are profound. New theoretical and cultural bases for planning and developing careers--especially needed in these critical times--are evident.

While vocational goals will still be pursued in the emerging culture, such goals, to command allegiance to career, must support the independent human roles that reinforce self-identity, promote pleasure, and provide psychic benefit. Goals that merely aim at survival and security will no longer suffice. To threaten with scarcities, to frighten with insecurities are no longer viable grounds for educating in an affluent society those who

are involved in enhancing the quality of life. Career education aimed at economic security and conventional social success will itself no longer be successful. Educational and career aims of the immediate future must become oriented toward human involvements that allow men to know and to be themselves, in helping others, in discovering and rediscovering the possibilities of being human, in pushing back the limits of human pleasure, cooperation and intelligence. Given the changing cultural patterns, there will be fewer and fewer takers of those career programs, vocations and professions which at best the problem of the past have promoted self-defense against social rejection, economic insecurity and power over other men.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Carr, Edward Hallett. The New Society. Boston: Beacon Press, 1957.

Clark, Burton R. Educating the Expert Society. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1962.

Drucker, Peter F. The Age of Discontinuity. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1969.

Gardner, John W. Self-Renewal: The Individual and the Innovative Society. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1963, 1965.

Glasser, William. "Two Blackboard Discipline Problems Handled Seven Ways: Four," Elementary School Journal (February 19, 1970), pp. 36-51.

Hocking, Paul. "The Problem of Intolerance," Radical Perspectives, edited by Alvin Toffler and Donald Brown. New York: Bloch and Schuster, 1968, pp. 98-115.

Green, Thelma. "Wilson's Speeches and the Foreign Affair," Southern Speech Journal, Vol. 27, No. 4 (Summer, 1971), pp. 303-317.

Hoffer, Eric. The Ordeal of Change. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1967.

Holton, George. "Science, Technology, and the Pursuit of Holiness," Saturday Review (October 2, 1971), pp. 23-25, 59, 62.

Perkinson, Henry J. The Imperfect Panacea: An Approach to Education. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1971.

Reich, Charles A. The Greening of America. New York: Random House, Inc., 1970.

Skinner, B. F. "Beyond Freedom and Dignity," Psychology Today, Vol. 5, No. 3 (August, 1971), pp. 37-80.

Soderquist, Harold O. The Person and Education: A New Approach to Philosophy of Education for Democracy. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1964.

Stanley, William O. Education and Social Integration. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1953.

Toffler, Alvin. Future Shock. New York: Random House, 1970.